



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,738	12/09/2004	Ian R Nandhra	FINDP001	5925
22434	7590	10/31/2007		
BEYER WEAVER LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			EXAMINER WONG, LESLIE	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,738

Applicant(s)

NANDHRA, IAN R

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/09/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 22 August 2007, is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Livowsky; Jean-Michel (US 6598039 B1)** in view of **Crandall et al. ("Crandall")(US. Patent 6,321,228 B1)**.

Regarding claim 1, **Livowsky** teaches a computer network having a plurality of interconnected computer resources, the computer network having associated with it a data repository that includes a plurality of data items in electronic format distributed widely among the interconnected computer resources, a method of locating portions of the electronic data in the data repository based on a search query (col. 2, lines 44-51), comprising:

- a). processing the search query to determine at least one meaning associated with the search query (col. 2, lines 33-43; col. 4, lines 44-48); and
- b). locating the portions of the electronic data based on the determined

Art Unit: 2164

meaning and in accordance with a context ascribed to the determined meaning with reference to meanings associated with previous data, located in response to previous search queries (col. 3, lines 54-57; col. 7, lines 62-64; col. 9, lines 11-15); and

c). conveying a result of the located data portions to a user (col. 3, lines 57-58).

Livowsky does not explicitly teach b). “meanings associated with previous result data”.

Crandall, however, meanings associated with previous result data (col. 6, lines 44-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Crandall's** teaching would have allowed **Livowsky's** to reduce the number of searches conducted by the users by sharing the results which contain web sites that are related to a specific topic as the search query by enabling the users to access selected records from results set that are derived from earlier search queries on the same topic.

Regarding claims 2, 3, and 8, **Livowsky** does not explicitly teach the steps of:

a). previous result data is organized in a particular manner to ascribe the context to the determined meaning; and

b). the locating step includes, based on the particular manner of organization,

comparing the determined meaning to the meanings associated with previous result data.

Crandall, however, teaches the steps of:

- a). previous result data is organized in a particular manner to ascribe the context to the determined meaning (col. 6, lines 44-48); and
- b). the locating step includes, based on the particular manner of organization, comparing the determined meaning to the meanings associated with previous result data (col. 5, line 65 - col. 6, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Crandall's** teaching would have allowed **Livowsky's** to reduce the number of searches conducted by the users by sharing the results which contain web sites that are related to a specific topic as the search query by enabling the users to access selected records from results set that are derived from earlier search queries on the same topic.

Regarding claims 4, 5, and 10, **Livowsky** does not explicitly teach maintaining a store of the meanings associated with the previous result data, organized in the particular manner.

Crandall, however, teaches maintaining a store of the meanings associated with the previous result data, organized in the particular manner (col. 6, lines 44-63 and col. 7, lines 16-18).

Regarding claim 6, **Livowsky** does not explicitly teach wherein the order of comparing is based at least in part on a relative frequency with which the previous result data has been accessed.

Crandall, however, teaches wherein the order of comparing is based at least in part on a relative frequency with which the previous result data has been accessed (col. 6, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Crandall's** teaching would have allowed **Livowsky's** to track and rank the activities performed on the associated web site by increasing a score associated with a bookmarked web page.

Regarding claim 7, **Livowsky** further teaches the steps of:

- a). search query is by a particular user (col. 2, lines 26-28);
- b). the previous search queries include search queries by users other than the particular user (col. 6, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 9, **Livowsky** does not explicitly teach the steps of:

- a). the method further includes maintaining a pointer store that includes at least one entry pointing to a store of previous result data; and
- b). the locating step includes initially locating the store of previous result data based on the pointer store.

Crandall, however, teaches the steps of:

- a). the method further includes maintaining a pointer store that includes at least one entry pointing to a store of previous result data (col. 8, lines 13-27); and
- b). the locating step includes initially locating the store of previous result data based on the pointer store (col. 8, lines 13-27).

Regarding claim 11, **Livowsky** does not explicitly teach the steps of:

the maintaining step includes, when a particular previous result data is located based on the search query, organizing the previous result data to influence the prominence with which the located particular previous result data affects the ascription of context.

Crandall, however, teaches the maintaining step includes, when a particular previous result data is located based on the search query, organizing the previous result data to influence the prominence with which the located particular previous result data affects the ascription of context (col. 8, lines 13-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Crandall's** teaching would have allowed **Livowsky's** to track and rank the activities performed on the associated web site by increasing a score associated with a bookmarked web page.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, **Livowsky** does not explicitly teach the steps of:

the previous result data are co-accessible by a plurality of users presenting search queries; and in the maintaining step, the organizing step is executed based on the particular previous result data located based on the search queries presented by the plurality of users

Crandall, however, teaches the steps of:

the previous result data are co-accessible by a plurality of users presenting search queries; and in the maintaining step, the organizing step is executed based on the particular previous result data located based on the search queries presented by the plurality of users (col. 6, lines 44-63; col. 8, lines 13-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Crandall's** teaching would have allowed **Livowsky's** to share the results which contain web sites that are related to a specific topic as the search query by enabling the users to access selected records from results set that are derived from earlier search queries on the same topic.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2164

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHARLES RONES can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Leslie Wong
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2164

LW
October 26, 2007